DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 236 JC 690 277

By-Brainard, Stephen R.

Personality Characteristics of Leaders Identifying with Different Student Subcultures.

Pub Date [69]
Note-13p.; NDEA Institute paper
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.75
Descriptors-*Junior Colleges, Leadership, Personality, *Personality Assessment, Personality Studies, Research, *Student Leadership, *Student Subcultures
Identifiers-Missouri

This study was conducted to discover differences in personality characteristics among student leaders. The personality characteristics of presidents of campus organizations affiliated with one of four distinguishable student subcultures, identified by previous research as vocational, academic, collegiate, and nonconformist, were measured by the Stern Activities Index. The index contains items to measure 12 factors of personality: self-assertion, audacity-timidity, intellectual interests, motivation, applied interests, orderliness, closeness, submissiveness, sensuousness, friendliness, expressiveness-constraint, and egoism-diffidence. Student leaders of the nonconformist subculture groups were omitted from the analysis because of the low frequency of response. Comparisons among the remaining groups were made for each of the factor means by the use of "t" tests. The significant differences found among the leaders were: (1) collegiate leaders scored higher on closeness and friendliness than the vocational or academic leaders; (2) on expressiveness-restraint, collegiate leaders scored higher than vocational leaders; (3) vocational leaders scored higher on applied interest than academic leaders; and, (4) academic leaders scored higher on motivation than collegiate leaders. It was concluded that the results of the research support the theory that student leaders possess different personality characteristics, depending on their particular reference group. (MB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
ERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
TATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
OSITION OR POLICY.

ED031236

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF LEADERS IDENTIF ING WITH DIFFERENT STUDENT SUBCULTURES

Stephen R. Brainard

University of Missouri

Several investigations have been conducted regarding the personality characteristics of student leaders (Stogdill, 1948; Flaherty, 1967; Johnson and Frandsen, 1962; Hartshorn, 1956). Generally, these studies have compared selected leaders with students in general or selected nonleaders. Recent literature in the social sciences has made reference to the existence of distinguishable student subcultures on the American university campus (Clark and Trow, 1966; Stern, 1963). Corresponding with the subcultural emphasis, attempts have been made to differentiate between student leaders who, by the nature of the organization they participate in, have been placed in different subcultural categories. Williamson and Hoyt, using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, discerned significant differences on certain scales for groups of leaders participating in five types of organizations (Williamson and Hoyt, 1952). Another study indicated significant differences between liberal and conservative political action group leaders on certain personality variables as measured by the California Psychological Inventory. "Liberal leaders tend to have lower superego strength, less concern for conventialities, and more interest in radical conditions and

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUL 23 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

circumstances than do conservative leaders" (Windborn and Jansen, 1967).

Clark and Trow have proposed a theoretical typological model of student subcultures, with four distinct subcultures being described. Each of the four subcultures, vocational, academic, collegiate, and nonconformist, has its own recognizable characteristics (Clark and Trow, 1966).

The purpose of this study was to attempt to answer the question of whether groups of student leaders participating in each of the four subcultures proposed by Clark and Trow had differential personality characteristics when compared with each other. The hypothesis stated in the operational null form was:

> There is no difference in Stern Activities Index responses made by groups of student leaders who identify with different subcultures within the University of Missouri, Campus at Columbia.

METHOD

Definition of Terms

Student leader- the president of a recognized student organization on the University of Missouri, Campus at Columbia.

Personality characteristic- one of twelve factors measured by the Stern Activities Index.

Student subculture- subculture is defined by the College Student Questionnaire (CSQ) which employs Clark and Trow's typology of student subcultures. A student will be identified as

participating in one of the four subculture by his reponse to questions 131-134 in Section 2, Part 2 of the CSQ.

Sample

The student leaders studies in this investigation included the population of presidents of recognized student organizations on the University of Missouri Campus. An official list published by the Office of the Dean of Students indicated 220 exclusively student organizations. All 220 presidents were asked to complete items 131-134 of Section 2, Part 2 of the CSQ. Of the 220 original presidents asked to participate, 152 responded. The responses are illustrated in Table one. A chi square analysis was performed to determine if frequencies deviated significantly from a uniform chance distribution (Edwards, 1968).

Insert Table 1 about here

In order that the number of Ss would be equalized for the final sample, thirty Ss were randomly drawn from the 92 leaders identifying with the collegiate subculture. The frequency of response for the nonconformist group (N=5) was considered too low to continue further investigation of the group. The Stern Activities Index was then sent to the final sample of leaders identifying with the vocational, academic, and collegiate subcultures.

Instrumentation

The Stern Activities Index (AI) was designed to provide a rather broad measure of personality. The instrument was modeled

after H.A. Murray's (1938) proposed "system for classifying the organizational tendencies that appear to give unity and direction to personality" (Stern, 1964). The AI consists of 30 scales of ten items each. From the 30 scales, fourteen personality factors were extracted by factor analysis. The factors are: Self-assertion (1), Audacity-Timidity (2), Intellectual Interests (3), Motivation (4), Applied interests (5), Orderliness (6), Submissiveness (7), Closeness (8), Sensuousness (9), Friendliness (10), Expressiveness-Constraint (11), Egoism-Diffidence (12), Timidity-Audacity (-2), Constraint-Expressiveness (-11), The two inverted factors were omitted from analysis in the investigation.

The College Student Questionnaire is "designed to facilitate the study of biographical and attitudinal characteristics of groups of college students" (Linn, Davis, and Cross, 1965). The section extracted from the CSQ (Section 2, Part 2, Items 131-134) is concerned with the identification by students of the philosophy of higher education which most appropriately applies to them. The student selects one of the following four philosophies:

Vocational- consists of students whose major purpose for attending college is to obtain a degree which will be instrumental in helping the student secure the job he could not otherwise obtain.

Academic- the student typically identifies himself with academic concerns of the more serious faculty members. These students are intrinsically interested in scholarship for its own sake.

Collegiate- the subculture is often referred to as the "fun culture". The lives of these students revolve around such activities as football, dates, fraternities, and drinking. These students are quite resistant to serious academic demands.

Nonconformist- the students have been typically referred to as the "bohemian", "alienated", or "radical" subgroup. "The distinctive quality of this student style is a rather aggressive non-conformism, a critical detachment from the college they attend and from its faculty, and a generalized hostility to the college administration " (Clark and Trow).

Data Analysis

Twelve factor means were calculated for each group. Specific hypotheses were not generated regarding the predicted mean differences. Consequently, a two-tailed *t* test was performed using Student's *t* Statistic. Mean difference comparisons were made between the three groups on all factors.

RESULTS

Based upon the analysis of mean differences, significant findings were discerned on five of the twelve personality factors. The results of the data analysis are illustrated in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Comparisons between the vocational and academic groups

Student leaders who identified with the vocational group differed significantly from those who identified with the

academic group on one factor, Applied Interests. The vocational students scored higher on the factor, indicating a greater "interest in achieving success in concrete, tangible, socially acceptable activities" (Stern, 1963). High scores on the factor seem to be related to an interest in activities which are typically characteristic of functions in business and industry. Mean differences on the eleven remaining factors were quite low, indicating a possible high degree of congruity between the two groups of leaders.

Comparisons between the vocational and collegiate groups

The vocational and collegiate leaders differed significantly on three factors, Closeness, Friendliness, and Expressiveness-Constraint. The collegiate group scored higher on all three factors. High scores on Closeness indicates a strong need for warmth and emotional supportiveness. The Friendliness factor involves a combination of affiliative and "playful" interests. The factor "involves a simple and uncomplicated form of amusement enjoyed in a group setting" (Stern, 1963). The Expressiveness-Constraint factor measures the degree of emotional lability accompanied with freedom from controls imposed by the self. Individuals scoring high on the factor are typically outgoing, spontaneous, impulsive, and uninhibited.

Comparisons between academic and collegiate groups

The academic and collegiate leaders differed on three factors, Motivation, Closeness and Friendliness. The academic group scored higher on Motivation and the collegiate group scored higher on Closeness and Friendliness. These results are

interpreted as meaning that the academic group has a stronger need in terms of competitiveness, perserverance, and intellectual aspiration, while the collegiate exhibits a stronger need in terms of affiliation, play, sexuality, supplication, nurturance and deference.

DISCUSSION

Student subcultures, which have been referred to throughout this report, are not clean, distinct entities which can be exactly, in qualitative or quantitative terms, delineated from each other. The Clark and Trow model employed to define the subcultures has not been empirically validated. The results of the study should be interpreted as suggestive rather than experimentally sound confirmation of theoretical statements.

The method employed to differentiate student leaders by subcultures was successful in discriminating on certain personality dimensions. This conclusion indicates the probable utility of the method if future investigations designed to separate students by subcultural groupings.

As a result of the low number in the defined student leader population, effort was not made to control for sex. Consequently, sex differences may have contributed to the employment of a confounding variable. The author suggests replication of the study controlling for sex.

The significant differences revealed were all in the direction suggested by the theoretical model. It seems quite logical to deduce that a student leader participating in the

collegiate or "fun" subculture would score significantly higher on scales such as closeness, friendliness, affiliation, play, etc., when compared to his compeers in the academic or vocational subculture. Likewise, it seems reasonable to conclude that a student leader in the vocational subculture would be more interested in applied, business-related activities when compared to his compeer in the academic subculture. Apparently, student leaders differ according to their reference groups, and the differences are predictable based on the unique characteristics which tend to describe the subcultural groups.

Aside from the differences found, there were a number of factors where mean differences were not significant, e.g., Self-Assertion, Audacity-Timidity, Egoism-Diffidence. These findings would seem to suggest further investigation to determine certain dimensions pervasive to leaders, regardless of their subgroup participation.

SUMMARY

Presidents of student organizations at the University of Missouri, Campus at Columbia, were compared on personality characteristics as measured by the Stern Activities Index. These student leaders were subdivided into three groups, the vocational, academic, and collegiate. The subdivision was accomplished by having the student select one of four philosophy statements descriptive of four student subcultures respectively. The *t* test comparisons between all groups revealed significant differences on five of 12 factors. The results seem to lend credence to the theory that student leaders do

possess different personality characteristics, dependent upon their particular reference group. The analysis also suggested the need for further investigation to determine if certain characteristics are pervasive to leadership regardless of participation in separate subcultures.

REFERENCES

Clark, B.R. & Trow, M., The Organizational Context. In T.M. Newcomb and E.K. Wilson (Eds.), College Peer Groups. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966, Pp. 17-70.

Edwards, A.L., Experimental Design in Psychological Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

Flaherty, R.M., Personality Traits of College Leaders., The Journal of Educational Research, 1967, 60, 377-8.

Hartshorn, E., A Comparison of Certain Aspects of Student Leadership and Non-Leadership., Journal of Social Psychology, 1956, 49, 512-22.

Johnson, R., and Frandsen A., The California Psychological Inventory Profile of Student Leaders. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1962, 41, 343-5.

Linn, R., Davis, J., & Cross, K., A Guide to Research Design: Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

Stern, George, Scoring Instruction and College Norms. Syracuse: Psychological Research Center, 1963.

Stern, George, Educational Theory, Academic Organization, and Adolescent Values. A synthesis of remarks from seminars and workshops, Syracuse: Syracuse University, 1964.

Stern, George, Environments for Learning. In Nevitt Sanford (Ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Stogdill, Ralph, Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature. Journal of Psychology, 1948, 25, Pp. 35-67.

Williamson, E.G., & Hoyt, D., Measured Personality Characteristics of Student Leaders. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1952, 12 Pp. 65-78.

Windborn, B., & Jansen, D., Personality Characteristics of Campus Social-Political Action Leaders. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, Pp. 509-13.

Table 1. Distribution of Responses to Philosophy Statements

	Vocational	Academic	Collegiate	Nonconformist
f	20	35	92	5
%	13.2	23.0	60.5	3.3

$\chi^2 = 119.96$

Table 2. Mean Scores and t Test of AI Factors for Vocational, Academic, and Collegiate Groups

	Factors	Mean Scores A	B	C
1.	Self-Assertion	20.00	20.33	21.80
2.	Audacity-Timidity	19.37	19.76	18.05
3.	Intellectual Interests	25.81	26.90	23.80
4.	Motivation	27.50	29.38	26.10
5.	Applied Interests	20.15	16.38	16.60
6.	Oderliness	22.87	19.43	20.60
7.	Submissiveness	22.81	23.05	24.85
8.	Closeness	23.25	22.86	28.30
9.	Sensuousness	12.75	12.90	15.50
10.	Friendliness	9.00	9.57	12.30
11.	Expressiveness-Constraint	14.25	17.19	20.70
12.	Egoism-Diffidense	9.81	9.76	9.60

A-Vocational
B-Academic
C-Collegiate

Table 2. Cont.

Factors	t Ratios AB	AC	BC
1. Self-Assertion	.15	.97	.68
2. Audacity-Timidity	.16	.62	.74
3. Intellectual Interests	.53	.90	1.37
4. Motivation	1.78	.73	2.99**
5. Applied Interests	2.00*	1.87	.11
6. Orderliness	1.60	1.05	.54
7. Submissiveness	.12	1.00	1.00
8. Closeness	.20	2.62*	2.78**
9. Sensuousness	.09	1.67	1.53
10. Friendliness	.38	2.10*	2.09*
11. Expressiveness-Constraint	1.36	3.45**	1.66
12. Egoism-Diffidence	.03	.15	.11

* $p<.05$
** $P<.01$